

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
CENTRAL DIVISION**

CYRILL A. KOLOCOTRONIS.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 05-4421-CV-C-SOW
)	
KITTY ZEUGIN, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Cyril Kolocotronis, an inmate confined at Fulton State Hospital, a Missouri mental institution, brought this case under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and its corresponding jurisdictional statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1343. This case was referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge for processing in accord with the Magistrate Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636, and L.R. 72.1.

Plaintiff seeks monetary and injunctive relief, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Named as defendants are Kitty Zeugin; Superintendent, Fulton State Hospital; and Director, Department of Mental Health. Plaintiff seeks to sue defendants for \$9,000, which plaintiff claims was taken from him by defendant Kitty Zeugin.

Plaintiff has requested leave to proceed without paying the filing fee, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Under section 1915, the court may waive filing fees and costs if it finds a plaintiff is indigent and if the claim should not be dismissed on certain other enumerated grounds. If appropriate, the court may impose a partial filing fee under L.R. 83.7. In re Williamson, 786 F.2d 1336 (8th Cir. 1986).

Plaintiff's affidavit indicates that he is indigent and currently unable to pay the full filing fee. Nevertheless, when a plaintiff seeks leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee, the court must dismiss the case if it finds the claim to be frivolous or malicious, if it fails to state a claim for which relief may be granted, or if it seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e)(2). The term "frivolous," as used in the statute,

does not necessarily imply the plaintiff's claims are unimportant, but may mean only that the federal court lacks the authority to address them.

Case law indicates that where a plaintiff seeks leave to proceed under section 1915, a claim should be dismissed if it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or fact" or is based on an "indisputably meritless legal theory." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327 (1989). The statute has been interpreted to give the court "the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint's factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless." Id. at 327. Baseless factual contentions are those that are "fanciful," "fantastic" or "wholly incredible." Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992) (citation omitted).

A general order was entered by this Court on August 28, 2003, (Attachment 1) forbidding plaintiff from filing further lawsuits in this Court unless it is determined that plaintiff's allegations involve some misconduct on the part of his guardian or that plaintiff is in some real danger of harm which is not adequately being addressed by his guardian and the state. In Re Cyril Athanasios Kolocotronis (W.D. Mo. Aug. 28, 2003); see also Kolocotronis v. Reddy, 247 F.3d 726, 727-28 (8th Cir. 2001) (mental patient who is a frequent filer of complaints that are often dismissed may be forbidden from filing further lawsuits without leave of the District Court).

Plaintiff's claims do not allege a threat of some real danger of harm to plaintiff or contain allegations of guardian misconduct; therefore, plaintiff may not bring his claim without the consent of his guardian. Id.

Furthermore, plaintiff's allegations fail to allege a viable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff, in essence, alleges state employees violated his due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment when they took his property. Generally, if a state provides adequate remedies to compensate individuals for wrongful property loss, there is no absence of due process. See Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 533 (1984) (intentional and negligent deprivations of property not actionable under section 1983 if suitable state remedy); Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 542 (1981).

Missouri provides adequate remedies to redress property damages. Orebaugh v. Caspari, 910 F.2d 526, 527 (8th Cir. 1990); Sours v. Armontrout, No. 87-1240, slip op. (8th Cir. June 1, 1987) (unpublished). Plaintiffs can sue in circuit court for replevin under Mo. S. Ct. R. 99.01 to

99.15, or they can bring a common-law claim for conversion. Hardesty v. Mr. Cribbin's Old House, Inc., 679 S.W.2d 343, 347 (Mo. App. 1984). See also Knight v. M.H. Siegfried Real Estate, Inc., 647 S.W.2d 811, 814 (Mo. App. 1982). Plaintiffs also can recover for losses caused by the tortious acts of state employees, acting in their ministerial capacities. See Harris v. Munoz, 2001 WL 118147 (Mo. App. Feb. 13, 2001); Jungerman v. City of Raytown, 925 S.W.2d 202 (Mo. Banc 1996); Jackson v. Wilson, 581 S.W.2d 39, 42-43 (Mo. App. 1979); Mo. Ann. Stat. § 105.711 (West Supp. 2005).

Plaintiffs who lack funds may seek to file and prosecute their claims as poor persons under Mo. Ann. Stat. § 514.040 (West 2002). This statute gives state judges the discretion to waive costs and fees for indigent parties. Thus, plaintiff may be able to obtain relief in state court even if he lacks funds.

IT IS, THEREFORE, RECOMMENDED that plaintiff be denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis and his claims be dismissed, pursuant to the general order In re Cyril Athanasios Kolocotronis (W.D. Mo. Aug. 28, 2003), and for failure to state a claim, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties may make specific written exceptions to this recommendation within twenty days. The District Judge will consider only exceptions to the specific proposed findings and recommendations of this report. Exceptions should not include matters outside of the report and recommendation. Other matters should be addressed in a separate pleading for consideration by the Magistrate Judge.

The statute provides for exceptions to be filed within ten days of the service of the report and recommendation. The court has extended that time to twenty days, and thus, additional time to file exceptions will not be granted unless there are exceptional circumstances. Failure to make specific written exceptions to this report and recommendation may result in a waiver of the right to appeal. See L.R. 74.1.

Dated this 27th day of February, 2006, at Jefferson City, Missouri.

/s/

WILLIAM A. KNOX
United States Magistrate Judge